DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 878 JC 760 638

AUTHOR Kerstiens, Gene
TITLE Tutor Perceptions as an Agent for Policy Change.
PUB DATE 20 Dec 76
NOTE 30p.; Ed.D. Practicum, Nova University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Junior Colleges; *Peer Teaching; Program Improvement; School Policy; Tutoring; *Tutors
IDENTIFIERS El Camino College

ABSTRACT

In order to improve the policies governing the El Camino College (California) Peer Tutoring Program, a survey instrument reflective of potential policy issues and concerns was constructed and then administered to the entire population of tutors (n=75) in order to learn their opinions concerning seventeen policies and conditions. The study design assumed that 51% or more of the tutors were in agreement with a given item on the survey, such would indicate that the policy issue reflective of the item was not worthy of review or consideration for change. It was also assumed that should a chi-square comparison of the responses of two sub-groups, tutor interns and peer tutors, prove to be significantly different in any item, priority would be given to the perceptions of the peer tutors, who are more experienced. Treatment of the data revealed that policies involving (1) tutorial meetings, (2) tutorial pay scales, (3) group tutoring, and (4) tutor training were deserving of review and possible revision or abandonment. Recommendations concerning the policy development process governing these four aspects were made as well as implications and recommendations for tutorial policies at the regional and national level. A bibliography, the survey instrument, and tabulated data are appended. (Author/JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131878

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TUTOR PERCEPTIONS AS AN AGENT FOR POLICY CHANGE

by

Gene Kerstiens
El Camino College

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

December 20, 1976

JC 760 638

ABSTRACT

In a study designed to adjust and improve the policies governing the El Camino College Peer Tutoring program, a survey instrument reflective of potential policy issues and concerns was constructed and then administered to the entire tutoring population (N=75) in order to learn tutors' perceptions concerning seventeen policies and conditions. The study design assumed that if fifty-one percent or more of the tutors were in agreement with a given item on the survey such would indicate that the policy issue reflective of the item was not worthy of review or consideration for change. It was also assumed that should a chi-square comparison of the responses of two sub-groups, tutor interns and peer tutors, prove to be significantly different on any item, priority would be given to the perceptions of the peer tutors, who are more experienced.

Treatment of the data revealed that policies involving (1) tutorial meetings, (2) tutorial pay scales, (3) group tutoring, and (4) tutor training were deserving of review and possible revision or abandonment. Recommendations concerning the process through which policies governing these four aspects were made as well as implications and recommendations concerning this study's impact upon tutorial policies at the regional and national level.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Problem 1

Significance of This Study 2

Objectives of the Study 4

Hypotheses 5

Assumptions 5

Definitions of Terms. 6

PROCEDURE 7

The Study Design 7

The Samples 7

Data Collection Procedures 9

Procedure for Treating Data 9

DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 12

Discussion 12

Implications 12

Recommendations 13

REFERENCES 15

APPENDICES 17

Appendix A 17

Appendix B 19

Appendix C 20

Appendix D 26

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

For the past five years, the peer tutoring program at El Camino College has developed as part of the College's instructional support system designed to help students survive and succeed in academic courses. As the program grew in response to student need, instructor acceptance, and administrative indulgence, various policies, practices and procedures have been developed to facilitate the program and, for the past year, have reached a seemingly workable status to the extent that policy has become recognized as "established." To a great degree, these policies have been initiated and sustained by the Director of Tutoring as he perceived the need for their employment and as he obtained direction from other members of the California Community College Tutorial Association and the National Association of Tutorial Services as well as concurrence with the Vice President of Instruction. This process of tutorial policy formulation is fairly consistent with those that have emerged on many other community college campuses throughout the nation and as reported by Brager (1973), Devirian (1974), Ludwig and Gold (1969), Ruggles, Bryant and Clark (1975), and Woolley (1976).

Periodically, El Camino College tutees are surveyed in order to evaluate the tutoring program from their perspective. To some extent, their collective responses have been instrumental in adjusting the

program to obtain salutary results. In like manner, instructors have been solicited for their input. However, except for their spontaneous voicing of opinions in tutorial meetings or in their semi-confidential reports and complaints to the Tutoring Director, the tutors have not had an opportunity to be involved in the formulation of policy in any formal fashion that measures and reflects their individual and collective concerns.

Inasmuch as the peer tutors in the El Camino College tutoring program are (1) themselves students currently pursuing courses in the College curriculum, (2) the participants most immediately (and intimately) involved in the tutoring process, and (3) therefore the agents best in a position to view tutorial policies and procedures as they apply at the tutor-tutee level of operation, it is posited that their perceptions of and opinions concerning present policy should find some formal representation in and influence upon that policy's continuance and/or possible reformulation. Such inclusion would also seem to address itself to charges that students' being systematically excluded from participation in most decisions concerning educational policy and governance has inhibited the effectiveness of many instructional operations (Armstrong 1972; Stemnock 1970; Taylor 1967).

The Significance of this Study

Although the professional literature reflects frequent studies reporting evaluations of community college tutoring programs in terms of outcomes, indications are that the majority of these studies have produced largely unrewarding results (see Devirian, 1974; Elliott, 1974;

and Woolley, 1976). Those designs utilized to assess the effectiveness of tutorial programs and services include measures involving the following variables: units completed by tutees; grade point average for tutored students; measured ability of tutees on standardized achievement tests or surveys of study habits and attitudes; pre and post test attitudes of tutees as reflected in a standardized instrument; persistence of tutees in currently enrolled courses; compared performance of tutored vs. non-tutored students taking the same class; and students' perceptions concerning whether the tutoring process had raised their achievement levels or had kept them from dropping the course(s; for which they received tutorial support. However, even supportive critics of tutoring programs generally agree that the research value of these studies is limited, especially because of the difficulty involved in developing and implementing a research design which reasonably controls interfering variables (see Agan, 1971; Brager, 1973; Cross, 1972; Ruggles, 1975; Stainback, 1975; and Woolley, 1976).

But whatever the shortcomings or virtues of evaluative studies designed to assess the value of tutoring <u>outcomes</u> in post-secondary education, this participant has been unable to locate a reported study that measures the effectiveness or viability of the <u>process</u> involved in a given tutorial program in terms of the perceptions registered by tutors employed in that program. Again, although there are studies that indicate the degree of student involvement in policy making concerned with tutoring and other instructional supportive services, these have been based upon student populations involved in student government

(Reed, 1975; Wassman, 1976) and not upon tutorial populations as such (see Armstrong, 1972; Elliott, 1974; Stemnock, 1970; and Wooley, 1976). Therefore, it is proposed that a study designed (1) to measure tutorial perceptions of policies, practices, and conditions as these obtain in a given tutorial program and then (2) to implement these perceptions so that they can be used to influence the direction of policy formulation represents an effort of modest significance.

The Objectives of the Study

This study was designed to perform two interrelated functions and therefore was carried out as a two-step process:

1. through the administration of an anonymous survey instrument essentially reflective of concerns currently and previously voiced by tutors, to determine the degree of agreement or disagreement of the entire tutoring staff with established policies and procedures as well as prevailing conditions attending the program so that tutors' perceptions can be reflected in policy formulation;
2. to separate the responses of tutor interns and peer tutors (see "Definitions of Terms," this practicum) in order that data concerning each group can be collected and compared to determine significance of difference and so that priority can be assigned to the perceptions of the peer tutor group and as explained under "Procedures for Treating Data," this practicum.

Hypotheses

Two null hypotheses were tested:

HYPOTHESIS ONE: Fifty-one percent or more of the entire tutoring population do not agree with policies, practices and conditions that are represented in items 3 - 19 of the survey instrument.

HYPOTHESES TWO: There is not a significant difference at the .05 level of confidence on items 3 - 19 of the survey instrument between the tutor intern and the peer tutor group.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made concerning the validity of this study.

1. *Since the survey instrument is anonymous, tutors would, thus unthreatened, record their frank perceptions.*
2. *Because all tutors engaging in the program were surveyed, the data would have the weight of a comprehensive survey, not merely a sampling.*
3. *Since the survey instrument makes provision for separating the responses of tutor interns (first-semester tutors) and peer tutors (seasoned tutors with more than one-semester's experience), data derived from peer tutor responses would deserve more weight and therefore more serious consideration than the data derived from tutor interns.*
4. *Inasmuch as tutors were informed that their collective responses would initiate serious reconsideration of any*

policy issues, tutors would respond with enthusiasm and due deliberation and reflection.

5. Since the survey made provision for written, unframed responses, it had the capacity to collect information that would not be otherwise reflected in the survey design and thus would expose any concerns that had not been anticipated by the survey's formulator.

Definitions of Terms

Tutor Intern: A currently enrolled student who (1) has received a B grade or higher in the course(s) for which he tutors, (2) has obtained written instructor recommendation to tutor such course(s), (3) has participated in both a group and individual orientation program, (4) participates in monthly tutorial meetings (one absence allowed per semester), (5) serves assigned tutees under the general supervision and guidance of the Tutorial Director, and (6) receives $2.20 per hour for his services.

Peer Tutor: A student who conforms to the definition of Tutor Intern and who also (1) has completed an inservice training program involving mediated instruction, textual study, and personal supervision, (2) has completed at least one semester's tutoring during which time he has successfully tutored three or more tutees for a total of 100 hours or more, (3) has passed a written test measuring knowledge of tutoring procedures and strategies, and (4) receives $2.50 per hour for his services.

Tutor: A generic term identifying "one who has knowledge or

expertise in a given area and who assists someone else in getting better understanding of the subject by mutually exploring those areas where learning is being blocked." (Egstrom, 1975)

PROCEDURE

The Study Design

The study was designed to effect tutor participation in tutorial policy formulation by implementing the following design:

1. *Developing a survey instrument that reflected presumed policy concerns of tutors;*
2. *Field-testing the instrument with seven tutors;*
3. *Interviewing the field-test tutors to assure a consistency in interpretation and to solicit suggestions for refinement;*
4. *Administering the refined tutorial survey to the entire tutoring population;*
5. *Tabulating the responses of the entire population being surveyed;*
6. *Separating the response sheets of peer tutors and tutor interns and tabulating the data derived separately;*
7. *Analyzing the data derived from step 6 above by means of the chi-square statistical technique to determine any difference, by item, between the two groups.*

The Samples

The sample involved a comprehensive population: the entire tutoring corps engaged in the tutoring program at El Camino College (N = 75) during the Fall 1976 semester and at the time of the survey's administration (December 2, 1976).

Since students involved in this sample are those who operate under policies governing the program, it is helpful in identifying this population to briefly describe tutorial policies and conditions.

If a student, his counselor, and/or his instructor feel that the student needs tutoring in a particular course, the student fills out an application for tutoring and personally approaches his instructor for written authorization for tutoring. If approval is granted, the student returns the approval form to the Tutorial Director, who arranges to procure a tutor whose abilities and available tutoring hours best match the specific disciplinary need and schedule of the tutee. Tutoring continues during the semester, but for no more than three hours per week, unless or until (1) the tutee drops the course in which he is being tutored, (2) the instructor or tutee feels that tutoring is no longer necessary, (3) the tutor and the Tutorial Director agree that the tutee is not benefiting from the process, or (4) the tutee fails to show for two scheduled tutoring appointments.

Tutor-tutee assignments can be changed if either party feels that the assignment of another tutor would result in more effective tutoring. Also, the tutee has the opportunity to submit a "Tutor Compliment/Complaint" form wher he chooses to register his opinion. Further, every paid tutoring session is verified in writing by a member of the staff. Finally, either in response to the instructor's request or the tutor's need for information or direction, instructor-tutor meetings are arranged, usually during the instructor's office hour.

A tutor's assignment to tutees is determined by tutee demand for the area of the tutor's competence, the tutor's priority in terms of

preparation and training, and his hours available for scheduled tutoring. When feasible, the tutor also engages in group tutoring (two or three tutees) for which he receives the typical hourly compensation.

Data Collection Procedures

At a December 2, 1976, tutorial meeting, the survey instrument (see Appendix A) was administered to all tutors attending. Absent tutors were contacted and were administered the survey the following day.

Completed copies of the survey were collected, and all items therein were mark-sensed on appropriate computer-compatible sheets. Also, all comments written on the surveys were recorded.

Procedure for Treating Data

The objective data derived from the mark-sensed survey sheets were treated as follows.

1. Sheets representing all tutors' responses were submitted in order to learn the percentage of responses of students in the six possible response categories for each item on the survey. These data are tabulated in Appendix B. According to these data, Hypothesis One was rejected, except that items 4, 5, 9, 16, 17, and 18 did yield percentages less than the fifty-one percent criterion stated in the hypothesis. Therefore, items 4, 5, 9, 16, 17, and 18 were temporarily identified as items representing policy and procedure issues that deserved reconsideration and possible resolvement.

2. Responses to item 1 on the survey made it possible to determine that the number of tutor interns represented was 44 or 59 percent of the total population and that the number of peer tutors was 31 or 41 percent of the total population.
3. Survey sheets for each group were separated and responses (on items 3 - 19) for each group were recorded and tabulated separately (see Appendix C) and arranged in cells.
4. In order to treat the data described in item 3 above, in items in which the volume of responses were not sufficient to obtain numbers that are appropriate for chi-square analysis purposes (minimum desirable N = 5) appropriate cells were coalesced in cases where such augmentation would not violate the intent of the survey (see Appendix C).
5. The data derived from the treatment described in item 4 above was key-punched and submitted for chi-square computer comparison analysis to learn that, except for items 9, 12, and 15, there was no significant difference between the two groups (see Appendix C). The item 9 comparison was determined to be significant at the .05 level of confidence; item 12 at the .01 level; and item 15 at the .05 level. Therefore, Hypothesis Two was rejected except for items 9, 12, and 15, and these items were identified as items representing policy and procedure issues that deserved reconsideration and possible resolvement in favor of the perceptions registered by the peer tutor group (N = 31) instead of those of the entire tutoring staff (N = 75) in the event that the perceptions

of the peer tutoring group and the tutor intern group were in conflict.

6. To determine whether the perceptions of the peer tutor and tutor intern group with respect to items 9, 12, and 15 were in conflict, these responses were compared (see Appendix D). It can be noted that on item 9 only 38 percent of the tutor interns responded to responses A and B. However, 68 percent of the peer tutors responded in these categories, indicating a conflict. The item 12 comparison reveals that 50 percent of the tutor interns responded to items A and B, and 81 percent of the peer tutors responded, indicating a conflict. The item 15 comparison indicates that the two groups are in essential agreement inasmuch as the 98 percent of the tutor interns and 97 percent of the peer tutors responded to responses A and B. Therefore, although the peer tutoring group registered <u>stronger</u> agreement than the tutor intern group on item 15, the two groups registered perceptions that are not in conflict. Accordingly only items 12 and 15 were considered as policy issues that deserved priority consideration in favor of the peer tutor group.

The last step in the data collection process was the recording and listing of written responses on the surveys. These are recorded verbatim in Appendix B. With the possible exception of two comments indicating that tutors favor pay for attendance at tutorial meetings, these comments do not reveal any significant consistency.

Discussion, Implications, and Recommendations

Discussion

The data derived from administration of the tutorial survey to the entire tutoring staff as well as the data yielded after chi-square comparison of the two tutoring sub-groups indicates, then, that items 4, 5, 16, 17, and 18 on the survey represent policy or procedure issues that deserve review. However, it should be noted that forty-nine percent of the entire tutoring staff responded to response "F" on item 18, indicating that these tutors had no basis for opinion or that the item was not applicable. Thus, the frequency of these responses uncovered a flaw in this study's design. Since only ten percent of tutees had been assigned peer counselors, it was not likely that many of the tutors would have had experience with peer counselors assigned to their tutees. Therefore, obtaining the fifty-one percent response criterion stated in Hypothesis One became difficult if not impossible to achieve. It would appear prudent, therefore, not to include item 18 as one of those worthy of occasioning review of policies that involve interaction between tutors and peer counselors.

Implications

If tutorial policy at the local level is to be responsive to the observations and opinions of the tutoring staff, then it is clear that policies and procedures represented by items 4, 5, 16, and 17 on the survey need to be analyzed and reviewed.

Since only 29 tutors or 47% responded affirmatively to item 4, apparently tutors feel that the content, style and/or frequency of monthly tutorial meetings do not serve them well. It also is quite

obvious that there is little satisfaction with the pay rate provided tutors, an attitude that is emphasized by the fact that two tutors wrote comments concerning this condition. Again, since on item 16 tutors indicated more disagreement than agreement in their reaction to the value of group tutoring, such data give rise to the notion that a substantial number of tutors either have developed an aversion to this process or that their experience in group tutoring has proved to be ineffective or unmanageable in their eyes. Finally, policy concerning the training of tutor interns by peer tutors constitutes an issue inasmuch as only 32 tutors or 43 percent indicate agreement and 25 or 33% indicate disagreement with item 17.

To the extent that items 4, 5, 16, and 17 reflect policies and procedures that are fairly consistent with those reported on the regional and national level (see Devirian, 1974; Hubin, 1976; Reed, 1975; Wassman, 1976; and Woolley, 1975), other tutorial directors might be encouraged to review their programs with a view to adjusting like policies and procedures.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made concerning tutorial policy at the local level.

1. Since, admittedly, previous tutorial meetings have tended to dwell on procedural and paperwork matters, emphasis should be given to the in-service aspect of the program in future meetings. Further, tutors should be solicited in order to learn how the style, content, and frequency of these meetings can be adjusted to meet their needs.

2. After a survey of tutorial pay scales in other comparable community colleges is effected, justification should be sought to raise the pay of tutors and to otherwise adjust the pay increments.
3. Policies governing group tutoring should be reviewed with a committee of tutors and, if possible, a study should be conducted to evaluate the effect of group tutoring versus individual tutoring.
4. Policy concerning the training of tutor interns should be reviewed with a committee composed of equal tutor intern and peer tutor representation to consider policy revision or abandonment.

At the regional and national levels, it is recommended that this study be replicated to determine whether the study design is generalizable and whether it has utility with respect to tutorial policy revision on other campuses.

REFERENCES

Agan, D. "A Study of the Achievement of Tutored Versus Non-Tutored College Freshman," Dissertation Abstracts, 32, 1971, 1207 A

Armstrong, R. Student Involvement. Analysis and Bibliography Series, No. 14. Oregon University: Eugene, 1972, ED 060 510

Bouchillon, B. "College Student Experiences in Tutoring," Tennessee Education, 3, February 1973, 19-21

Brager, G. "The Tutorial Project: A Successful School Experience," Journal of the International Association of Pupil Personnel Workers, 17, March 1973, 88-99

Cross, P. and Jones, P. "Problems of Access," in Explorations in Non-Traditional Study, Samuel Gould and K. Patricia Cross (Eds.), Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, 1972, 39-61

Devirian, M. "Survey of Functions of Learning Programs at Two and Four Year Public Colleges and Universities in California," About Tutoring, 1, November 1974, 5-8

Elliott, D. "The Fullerton College Student Tutorial Assistance Program: An Evaluation," Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, August 1974, 836 A

Engstrom, H. "Tutoring--a Process of Involvement," About Tutoring, 2, February 1975, 1 and 4

Gleazer, E. This is the Community College. Houghton Mifflin: Boston, 1968

Hubin, D. "Subject Area Tutoring: A Wild Card in the Learning Center," In Ninth Proceedings of the Western College Reading Association, Roy Sugimoto (Ed.), Long Beach: The Association, 9, 1976, 94-99

Ludwig, L. and Gold, B. The Developmental Studies and Tutorial Programs: A Progress Report. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, April 1969, ED 031 231

The Peer Teaching Program of Community College Studies. U.S. Educational Resources Information Center, March 1972, ED 060 837

Reed, R. Peer-Tutoring Programs for the Academically Deficient Student in Higher Education. Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1975

Roueche, J. "Accountability for Student Learning in the Community College," Educational Technology, 11, January 1971, 46-47

Ruggles, D., Bryant, J. and Clark, W. "Tutoring and American Higher Education: An Historical Perspective and Current Response," About Tutoring, 2, March 1975, 2-7

Stemnock, S. Framework for Student Involvement. American Association of School Administrators: Washington, D.C., National Education Association, 1970, ED 047 384

Stainback, W. "The Research Evidence Regarding the Student-to-Student Tutoring Approach to Individualized Instruction," Educational Technology, 15, February 1975, 54-56

Taylor, H. "Unmuffling Student Influence," Change, 8, September 1976, 17-19

Wassman, R. "Revelations from Statewide Reading Program Visitations," in Ninth Proceedings of the Western College Reading Association, Roy Sugimoto (Ed.), Long Beach: The Association, 9, 1976, 204-208

Woolley, J. "Tutorial Services at California Community Colleges." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Brigham Young University, 1976

APPENDIX A

PEER TUTORING SURVEY

(PLEASE DO NOT SIGN THIS SURVEY)

INDICATE YOUR TUTORING EXPERIENCE BY CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE LETTERS FOR ITEMS (1) AND (2).

(1) You have been tutoring for (A) One Semester, (B) Two semesters or more. A B

(2) Your tutoring time averages (A) Between 1 & 4 hours per week; (B) 5 & 10 hours; (C) 11 & 15 hours; (D) 16 & 20 hours per week. A B C D

ANSWER EACH OF THE FOLLOWING BY CIRCLING THE RESPONSE THAT BEST REPRESENTS YOUR OPINION:

A. Strongly agree, B. Agree, C. Neutral, D. Disagree, E. Strongly disagree, F. Not applicable or no basis for opinion.

(3) The system for selecting tutors is fair and effective. A B C D E F

(4) Tutorial meetings are helpful and relevant A B C D E F

(5) The tutorial pay scale is adequate and fair. A B C D E F

(6) The system used to assign tutees to tutors is fair and effective. A B C D E F

(7) You are able to get all of the tutoring time that you can legitimately perform. A B C D E F

(8) Your tutees deserve and need the tutoring that they are getting. A B C D E F

(9) When you appear to discuss tutoring strategies with an instructor, he is available for conference. A B C D E F

(10) Tutees are as serious and responsible about the tutoring process as you are. A B C D E F

(11) The Learning Assistance Center lends itself to the kind of atmosphere conducive to tutoring. A B C D E F

(12) You feel comfortable about recommending changes in the tutoring policy or the program. A B C D E F

(13) You believe that your tutees would not succeed as well in their courses without your assistance. A B C D E F

(14) Faculty believe that tutoring is effective and support the program. A B C D E F

(15) Tutoring is a learning process for you as well as the tutee. A B C D E F

(16) When it is possible to make such an arrangement, group tutoring (two or three tutees) is as effective as individual tutoring. A B C D E F

(17) It is helpful to have an experienced tutor train an inexperienced tutor. A B C D E F

(18) Peer counselors are effective in counseling tutees who encounter problems receiving tutoring. A B C D E F

(19) The Tutorial Handbook is helpful to me. A B C D E F

TUTORIAL SURVEY RESPONSE TABULATION (N = 75)

		Percentages					
(1)	You have been tutoring for (A) One semester, (B) Two semesters, (C) Three or more semesters.	(A) 58.66	(B) 22.66	(C) 18.66	(D) ----	(E) ----	(F) ----
(2)	Your tutoring time averages (A) Between 1 & 4 hours per week; (B) 5 & 10 hours; (C) 11 & 15 hours; (D) 16 & 20 hours per week.	37.33	38.66	17.33	6.66	----	----
	Answer each of the following by circling the response that best represents your opinion: (A) Strongly agree, (B) Agree, (C) Neutral, (D) Disagree, (E) Strongly disagree, (F) No basis for opinion or not applicable.						
(3)	The system for selecting tutors is fair and effective.	16.00	60.00	16.00	1.33	2.66	4.00
(4)	Tutorial meetings are helpful and relevant.	8.00	38.66	24.00	10.66	5.33	13.33
(5)	The tutorial pay scale is adequate and fair.	1.33	25.33	20.00	21.33	30.66	1.33
(6)	The system used to assign tutees to tutors works well.	9.33	49.33	20.00	13.33	2.66	5.33
(7)	You are able to get all of the tutoring time that you can legitimately perform.	20.00	42.66	9.33	10.66	14.66	2.66
(8)	The tutees that you tutor deserve and need the tutoring that they are getting.	40.00	48.00	8.00	4.00	00.00	00.00
(9)	When you appear to discuss tutee strategies with an instructor, he/she is available for conference.	16.00	33.33	26.66	4.00	1.33	18.66
(10)	Tutees are as serious and responsible about the tutoring process as you are	18.66	41.33	18.66	20.00	1.33	00.00
(11)	The Learning Assistance Center lends itself to the kind of atmosphere conducive to tutoring.	21.33	52.00	18.66	6.66	1.33	00.00
(12)	You feel comfortable about recommending changes in the tutoring policy or the program.	18.66	44.00	21.33	4.00	1.33	10.66
(13)	You believe that your tutees would not succeed as well in their courses without your help.	26.66	57.33	9.33	5.33	00.00	1.33
(14)	Faculty believe that tutoring is effective and support the program.	14.66	44.00	22.66	1.33	00.00	17.33
(15)	Tutoring is a learning process for you as well as the tutee.	66.66	28.00	4.00	00.00	00.00	1.33
(16)	When it is possible to make such an arrangement, group tutoring (two or three tutees) is as effective as individual tutoring.	8.00	18.66	20.00	22.66	8.00	22.66
(17)	It is helpful to have an experienced tutor train an inexperienced tutor.	10.66	32.00	20.00	18.66	4.00	14.66
(18)	Peer counselors are helpful in counseling tutees who encounter problems receiving tutoring.	8.00	16.00	22.66	4.00	00.00	49.33
(19)	The Tutorial Handbook is helpful to me.	9.33	52.00	17.33	10.66	1.33	9.33

The Following Notes Were Written On The Survey Sheets:

"Should get paid for time spent in tutorial meetings."

"Pay for Tutor meetings."

"Please give more notice as to when the tutor meetings are."

"I wish an experienced tutor were available to help a little with the new tutors."

"Question 3. What is the system of choosing tutors? Not alphabetical order, I hope."

"#6 -- only if they have the same instructor!"

APPENDIX C

CHI-SQUARE COMPARISON
OF TUTOR INTERN GROUP = 1
AND PEER TUTOR GROUP = 2

Significance

Item #3

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	6	25	8	1	1	3
2.	6	20	4	0	1	0

	SA	A	N
1.	6	25	8
2.	6	20	1

Not Significant

Item #4

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	4	18	10	4	0	8
2.	2	11	8	4	4	2

	SA/A	N	D/SD
1.	22	10	4
2.	3	8	8

Not Significant

Item #5

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	0	14	9	10	10	1
2.	1	6	6	6	13	0

	SA/A	N	D	SD
1.	14	9	10	10
2.	6	6	6	13

Not Significant

Significance

Item #6

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	2	19	9	8	2	4
2.	5	18	6	2	0	0

	SA/A	N	D/SD
1.	21	9	10
2.	23	6	2

Not Significant

Item #7

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	5	18	5	5	10	1
2.	10	14	2	3	1	1

	SA	A	D/SD
1.	5	18	15
2.	10	14	4

Not Significant

Item #8

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	18	22	2	2	0	0
2.	12	14	4	1	0	0

	SA	A
1.	18	22
2.	12	14

Not Significant

Significance

Item #9

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	4	12	18	2	0	8
2.	8	13	2	1	1	6

	SA	A	N	D/SD	NA
1.	4	12	18	2	8
2.	8	13	2	2	6

Significant at .05 Level

Item #10

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	8	17	8	10	1	0
2.	6	14	6	5	0	0

	SA	A	N	D
1.	8	17	8	10
2.	6	14	6	5

Not Significant

Item #11

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	4	22	9	4	1	0
2.	8	17	5	1	0	0

	SA	A	N
1.	8	22	9
2.	8	17	5

Not Significant

Significance

Item #12

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	3	19	14	2	1	5
2.	11	14	2	1	0	3

	SA	A	N	D/SD	NA
1.	3	19	14	3	5
2.	11	14	2	1	3

Significant at the .01 Level

Item #13

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	8	28	6	1	0	1
2.	12	15	1	3	0	0

	SA	A	N	D
1.	8	28	6	1
2.	12	15	1	3

Not Significant

Item #14

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	5	18	12	0	0	9
2.	6	15	5	1	0	4

	SA	A	N
1.	5	18	12
2.	6	15	5

Not Significant

Significance

Item #15

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	24	17	2	0	0	1
2.	26	4	1	0	0	0

	SA	A	N
1.	24	17	2
2.	26	4	1

Significant at the .05 Level

Item #16

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	3	6	10	10	3	12
2.	3	8	5	7	3	5

	SA/A	N	D/SD	NA
1.	9	10	13	12
2.	11	5	10	5

Not Significant

Item #17

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	3	15	9	7	2	8
2.	5	9	6	7	1	3

	SA/A	N	D/SD
1.	18	9	9
2.	14	6	8

Not Significant

Significance

Item #18

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	5	6	12	0	0	21
2.	1	6	5	3	0	16

	SA/A	N	NA
1.	11	12	21
2.	7	5	16

Not Significant

Item #19

	SA	A	N	D	SD	NA
1.	3	26	9	3	1	2
2.	4	13	4	5	0	5

	SA/A	N	D/SD
1.	29	9	4
2.	17	4	5

Not Significant

APPENDIX D

COMPARISON OF TUTOR INTERNS' (N = 44)
AND PEER TUTORS' (N = 31) PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES
ON ITEMS 9, 12, and 15 OF TUTORIAL SURVEY

Item #9

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Tutor Interns	9.09	27.27	40.90	4.54	0.00	18.18
Peer Tutors	25.80	41.93	6.45	3.22	3.11	19.35

Item #12

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Tutor Interns	6.81	43.18	31.81	4.54	2.27	11.36
Peer Tutors	35.48	45.16	6.45	3.22	0.00	9.67

Item #15

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Tutor Interns	59.54	38.63	4.54	0.00	0.00	2.27
Peer Tutors	83.87	12.90	3.22	0.00	0.00	0.00

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
JAN 7 1977
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES